DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 076 JC 710 004

AUTHOR	Gaddy, Dale
TITLE	The Scope of Organized Student Protest in Junior Colleges.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	30p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of Junior Colleges, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.60
DESCRIPTORS	*Activism, *Demonstrations (Civil), *Junior Colleges, Social Action, *Student Alienation, Student Attitudes, Student Behavior, *Student College Relationship

ABSTRACT

Junior colleges, compared with 4-year colleges and secondary schools, experience little student dissent. The extent of protest at junior colleges, however, is underestimated by junior college administrators, faculty, and the general public. In a survey of 841 junior college deans of students, 231 (37.7 per cent of the 613 who responded) reported 1,586 incidents of student protest during the 1968-69 academic year. The most frequent issues were: (1) student-administration affairs regarding institutional services, dress and living regulations, and grievance procedures; (2) off-campus interests in military service and civil rights; (3) instruction; (4) faculty; and (5) freedom of expression. The greatest percentage of students, however, protested tuition charges, residence and student drinking regulations, and mandatory attendance at school functions. While geographic location is not related to student activism, the larger and urban junior colleges have more protests than smaller and rural or suburban colleges. To minimize the number and severity of protests, it is necessary to develop effective communications between students and college officials to make necessary instructional and institutional reforms, and to give students and faculty more power in governing their affairs. The junior colleges must examine their philosophies and goals in an effort to be increasingly responsive to student and community needs. (CA)

ED 045076

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Scope of Organized Student Protest in Junior Colleges

By Dale Gaddy

JC 710 004

American Association of Junior Colleges

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JAN 12 1971

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY THE AUTHOR AND THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Price: $2.00

Copyright 1970: American Association of Junior Colleges
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
Printed in U.S.A.

Contents

Acknowledgements v

Foreword vii

Introduction ix

Chapter I. The Rise of Student Activism 1

Chapter II. The Survey Instrument 7

Chapter III. Junior College Student Protest 9

Chapter IV. Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations 15

Bibliography 17

Appendix A—Questionnaire 19

Appendix B—Cover Letters 23

Appendix C—Additional Issues 25

Acknowledgements

To each of the following, a special note of appreciation is extended:

--B. Lamar Johnson, distinguished professor of education, University of California, Los Angeles, for awarding the post-doctoral fellowship that made this study possible and for giving guidance and constructive criticism throughout the 1969-70 academic year;

--the Kellogg Foundation, for making available such fellowships as the one under which this study was conceived and completed;

--the New Institutions Project, supported by the Danforth Foundation and formerly directed by Richard E. Wilson at the American Association of Junior Colleges, for funds to publish the final report;

--Arthur M. Cohen, professor of education at UCLA and director of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, for cooperation that made this year of post-doctoral study possible, and for making available the services of the Clearinghouse in the preparation of this report;

--Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., executive secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges, and Roger Yarrington, director of publications, for their support and assistance in circulating the questionnaire;

--Aikin Connor, for supervising the computation and analysis of the data;

--Hazel Horn, for editing the final report;

--Educational Testing Service for licensing the adaptation of an earlier questionnaire developed by Richard E. Peterson, and to Peterson himself for advice concerning revisions and applications of the junior college edition;

--and to my wife, Jeanne, for her continued encouragement and inspiration.

Dale Gaddy

Foreword

Student unrest, protest, and activism are important realities in the life of our nation. Violence at Berkeley and Columbia, at Kent State and Jackson State, are headlined in newspapers and widely reported and discussed on television. Student activism is the subject of oratory in the halls of Congress and is studied by legislative, congressional, and presidential commissions.

Although four-year colleges and universities have taken the headlines, student unrest has also come to the junior college. The nature and extent of student protest in our community junior colleges, however, has up to the present been unknown. Dale Gaddy's nationwide survey of student protest in the junior college, therefore, meets an important need both in the literature of the junior college and in that of student activism.

The extent of interest in student protest in the junior college is indicated by the fact that administrators at more than 75 per cent of the membership of the American Association of Junior Colleges completed the relatively long inquiry form on which the survey is based.

One of the most important findings of the survey is that the extent of student protest in the junior college is larger than is usually estimated by junior college administrators, by faculties, and by the general public. During 1968-69, almost two-fifths (37.6 per cent) of the responding colleges had one or more incidents of organized student protest. If the study had been made one year later, it is likely that the incidence of protest would have been even higher. Student activism has indeed come to the junior college.

In presenting his conclusions and recommendations, the author, in part, writes:

> Board members, faculties, laymen, and especially administrators should be more sensitive to the restlessness that exists in the junior college today, for, while activism is not as rampant in two-year colleges as at four-year or secondary institutions, the time has ceased to be when junior colleges were cloaked with veils of tranquility. Unless administrators, as change agents, take the initiative to become more aware of and responsive to current protests, junior colleges may soon find themselves in the same quagmire that engulfed the Berkeleys, Columbias, and Kent States of higher education.

Strong words are these! But they are supported by the findings of the survey.

This paper will be valuable to those who wish to understand the range, nature, and causes of student protest in the junior college. They include junior college administrators, faculties, students, and boards of trustees--as well as legislators, government officials, and the general public.

Dale Gaddy made this survey during the year of post-doctoral study at the University of California, Los Angeles, under a fellowship financed by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Dr. Gaddy is currently director of the Microform Project of the American Association of Junior Colleges, with his office at Association headquarters in Washington, D. C.

B. Lamar Johnson
Los Angeles, California

Introduction

Incidents of student protest at four-year colleges and universities and, more recently, at secondary schools have been widely reported in the news media and in educational journals. Many of these reports have been based on research or surveys.

Yet student activism at junior colleges has received little attention from the public press, radio, or television–or from educational researchers. It is difficult, and at times either impossible or inappropriate, for junior college officials to develop workable solutions to campus unrest solely on the basis of data relating to other levels of education. Unless junior college officials know the extent of activism at their own institutions, it is impossible to know how best to respond to current crises or how best to avoid potential conflicts.

To what extent are junior colleges experiencing protest? In what types of junior colleges are protests most frequent? In what types of communities are protests most common? In what regions of the country do protests occur most often? Have junior colleges developed "riot plans" for implementation when disturbances occur? What are the issues of protest in junior colleges? What percentages of the student bodies and the faculties are involved in protest activities? What relationships exist between and among such factors as size of enrollment, residence of students, the percentage of minority students enrolled, the percentage of radical students enrolled, and the issues of protest themselves?

Questions such as these led to the present study. Findings reported here are based on responses to questionnaires circulated in February 1970 to the deans of students at 841 junior colleges throughout the United States, American two-year institutions located in foreign lands, and two-year colleges in Canada, British Honduras, and the Dominican Republic. In addition, a review of recent research and writings pertaining to student activism is included.

Following the introduction are four chapters:

I. The Rise of Student Activism
II. The Survey Instrument
III. Junior College Student Protest
IV. Summary and Conclusions

Also included are appendices (including the cover letters, the questionnaire, and data submitted by the respondents) and a bibliography.

CHAPTER I
The Rise of Student Activism

The phenomenon of student activism became the hallmark of education in the 1960's and threatens to hold center stage for at least the immediate future. Like the roots of a great tree, student activism has spread far and deep, making it difficult (if not impossible) to measure its extent. Nevertheless, descriptive and analytical reports on student activism have been disseminated. The more significant reports constitute the basis for the following overview of student activism--its origins, its elements, and its permeation of the educational world today.

Calm Before the Storm

Ascribing a date to the origin of student activism is as difficult--and perhaps as impractical--as pinpointing the beginning of time. Certainly violence is as old as time itself, but activism is not necessarily synonymous with violence. As used in this treatise, *activism* refers to action taken by students that brings them into conflict with educational and civil authorities. At times, the action *may* erupt into violence resulting in substantial and material interference with the educational or societal process--including the destruction of property and/or injury or death to human beings. Undoubtedly this is the image that has been etched into contemporary minds, but, more often than not, actions of students take less extreme forms. One needs to look back only a few years to find a more tranquil scholastic scene.

Until the mid-1960's, American students were characterized by their indifference. This is not to say that conflict was totally absent, nor that violence was unknown at various levels of education. Although not atypical today, statements such as "To hell with the America (sic) government. We need a change of government, and Socialism and Sovietism will accomplish it," were uttered by a college radical in the 1920's (25). During the 1950's in particular, "panty raids" were the rage at college campuses throughout the nation. Generally, however, students were more mischievous than militant, more passive than active.

What happened to the "good old days?"

As with all myths, the good old days never were. Perhaps apathy lulled the student of bygone decades into passivity and complacency--but complacency does not necessarily connote absolute acceptance or approval of one's environment. Protests in the form of petitions, letters to the editor, and resolutions were commonly made at colleges and universities throughout most of the history of American education and continue to this day.

Underneath the seeming tranquility, certain conditions were already nurturing the seeds of discontent. The principle of *in loco parentis* continued to dominate the administrative structure of most colleges and universities until recent times, and often contributed to friction between students and institutional authorities. Following World War II, for example, American G.I.'s who were interested in pursuing their education were treated, in many instances, like schoolboys--often finding themselves prohibited from the freedoms and rights normally accorded servicemen and non-students. Other students, many of whom were married and had families of their own, found themselves similarly relegated to a "schoolboy" status.

The problem of race relations also aggravated the educational setting; Negroes (and other minorities) found themselves victims of a second-class citizenship, often unable to pursue education at the institutions of their choice.

Still, little evidence of activism surfaced.

Then, in 1954, a milestone was passed, not only in American education but in all facets of American society: the United States Supreme Court decision of *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* (5). No longer was the doctrine of "separate but equal" condoned. Within the next few years, desegregation would be extended from schools to housing, employment, restaurants, places of recreation and entertainment, and all public facilities.

The move from court decrees (or action by legislative, executive, or religious bodies) to social acceptance is sometimes acrimonious. This has been true particularly in the area of race relations. Much, if not most, of the social acceptance of minorities has come, not from pronouncements of a higher authority, but from agitation by the suppressed--agitation for the recognition of certain inalienable rights. And so it was that confrontation in the form of freedom rides, sit-ins, and picketing came to be socially acceptable to Americans who regarded many of the laws and customs of the establishment as "bad."

By the early 1960's, civil rights workers were being joined in their quest by growing numbers of college students (including a substantial number of whites). Idealists, perhaps--activists, surely. Whatever the labels, their ideas were actively carried into and beyond the arenas of racial struggle. Gallagher later would write:

> They [college students] felt a moral compulsion to use their summer months in active work throughout the South and North. Returning to the serenity of the campus, they were restless under the contrast. If they had been men enough to stand up to a police dog or a sheriff's electric cattle prod, if three of their number had become martyrs and lay beneath a Mississippi earthen dam, how could they return to the cloistered round of studies and examinations? Involvement, not detachment, became their ideal--not contemplation and inquiry, but

> direct action and sloganeering. They had heard the presidents of their colleges . . . say that "freedom is indivisible." Very well, then, academic freedom, civil rights, and civil liberties are a single continuum (13:58).

The activists, in other words, had become instrospective about campus injustices as well as the injustices of a racist society.

Simultaneous with the civil rights movement was the growing recognition of the value of education--to the nation's security and to the individual's well-being. The aftermath of Sputnik witnessed an alarmed populace whose elected representatives would legislate millions of additional dollars for educational programs that, it was hoped, would insure America's superiority to all foreign powers. The judicial system had underscored the importance of education to an individual with such words as "it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education" (5) and "education is vital and, indeed, basic to civilized society" (9). By the 1960's, education--even higher education--was regarded as a right (for those who were intellectually capable of pursuing it), not merely a privilege.

The Vietnam War is another factor of monumental significance. It has served as a catalyst to the student activist movement, evoking more severe college protests than any other single issue. Edward Najam, as president of the student body at Indiana University, described this development in 1969:

> . . . not until Vietnam emerged as the principal national issue did campus protest become a common occurrence. Large numbers of students, exposed to the history and political realities of Southeast Asia and acquainted with the problems of developing nations, have not subscribed to the blind patriotism that has characterized much of the general public. Though the war itself provided a stimulus for widespread student activity, it also served to dislodge other complaints about the present social order (21:751).

Continuing, Najam articulated the student viewpoint on other issues:

> Students are conscious that, though they enjoy the fruits of affluence, America has not honored its promise to all its people, that millions of poor Americans, black and white, are not sharing in the nation's wealth, that many Black Americans are still struggling for the most basic kind of human dignity. Thus students are not objecting to affluence itself but to the way it is being handled both domestically and in our foreign relations. They are equally concerned, perhaps more concerned, about a society, a social system in which the individual is losing his sense of identity in a great philosophy of consensus (21).

Conditions in American society that, by the 1960's, had become condusive to violence on a scale never before seen, are summarized by Los Angeles District Attorney E.J. Younger as follows:

1. A permissive society in which persons adopt the attitude that they will obey those laws they like and ignore those they do not like
2. Substandard schools, often in the very areas where the best teachers and facilities are needed
3. Untrained and unqualified administrators who cannot cope with such subjects as mob psychology and guerrilla tactics
4. Highly educated teenagers with time on their hands and a high degree of social consciousness and impatience with slow progress in solving problems
5. Professional troublemakers who create disruptions
6. Increasingly militant teachers (37).

Becoming more aware of and involved in the social problems of America and the nation's involvements abroad, and becoming cognizant of the nation's emphasis on education, students began to demand the recognition of certain "rights." Basic to these was the freedom to learn--to exchange ideas freely without fear of academic penalization. The seeds of discontent had begun to sprout.

Thunderbolts of Activism

The year was 1964. The Free Speech Movement had attracted a following of thousands at the Berkeley campus of the University of California, and soon drew nationwide attention as masses of student demonstrators converged on the West Coast campus in a manner resembling the civil rights crusades. Never before had so many students voiced their grievances so loudly. And never before had so many witnesses outside the campus gates viewed such intense turmoil on a college campus. The day of live television coverage had arrived and viewers throughout the nation were fed a constant stream of eye-witness reports of college chaos.

Whether from inner motivation, from agitation by non-campus sources, or from a desire simply to mimic the actions of militant students elsewhere, college students began organizing protest efforts throughout the nation. Like bolts of lightning ricocheting from campus to campus, student activism spread with electric speed, creating fear, disgust, shock, and anger among its opponents and zealous idealism among its proponents. Voiced (and sometimes heard) were student cries for a more relevant education, for more representation in academic governance, for treatment of students as human beings rather than as statistics, and for educational and social changes regarding domestic and foreign issues. Students, aided at times by militant (or at least sympathetic) professors and others, backed their demands with sit-ins, lie-ins, teach-ins, picketing, and other highly visible means of opposition. At times they chose to take more coercive action. In consequence, violence, although thus far the exception, occurred on the college campus more frequently than ever before.

By the end of the 1960's, according to one report (30), the nation's colleges were witnessing student protests at the rate of 48.6 per month. At times, e.g., April 1970, the rate increased to twenty-five demonstrations per week (23). Despite Clark Kerr's 1967 and 1970 predictions to the contrary (31:1), rebellion on college campuses continued to dominate educational affairs, as witnessed by the most costly of all student protests: the May 1970 calamity of Kent State University, in which four students were killed (32). The event

prompted President Nixon to state:

> This should remind us all once again that, when dissent turns to violence, it invites tragedy. It is my hope that this tragic and unfortunate incident will strengthen the determination of all the nation's campuses, faculty and students alike, to stand firmly for the right which exists in this country of peaceful dissent and just as strongly against resort to violence as a means of such expression (15:6).

Junior College and Pre-College Students Follow Suit

Activism has not been limited to the campuses of four-year colleges and universities. Evidence shows that student protests have increased at junior colleges, high schools, and even elementary schools (3;17:1). Trump and Hunt's survey of 1,982 junior and senior high schools reveals student protests in 67 per cent of the nation's urban schools, in 67 per cent of the suburban schools, and in 53 per cent of the rural schools (33:151). A national news magazine reported in February 1970 that 6,000 protests occurred in the nation's public schools (35:65). The influence of college activists on younger students cannot be denied in view of a recent statement by Michael Klonsky, national secretary for the Students for a Democratic Society: "Our biggest growth [in terms of newly recruited members] has been among high school and junior high school students" (29:639).

Junior colleges, wedged between secondary education and four-year institutions of higher learning, have reportedly experienced less extreme student protest (3:14-15). Nevertheless, in the most comprehensive description of junior college student activism published up to that time, Lombardi (18:1) asserts that by 1969 junior college students had become the most active since the 1930's. He attributes this development to the influence of students at four-year colleges and universities:

> . . . it seems as if junior college students and their advisors take their cues from their counterparts in senior colleges on nearly every issue.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> That four-year colleges and universities should be the inspiration, if not the source, of activism on junior college campuses should not be surprising, since they are the institutions to which many junior college students aspire. If four-year colleges and universities did not exist, junior college activism would have arisen, but probably in an even milder form than the present (18:7, 9).

Reasons cited by Lombardi for the moderate level of junior college student activism include:

1. Large enrollments of minority students at many two-year institutions, thus minimizing the demand for minority admissions
2. Low or no tuition, which erases the need for scholarship demands
3. Effective counseling and guidance services that help students realize their "identities"
4. Wide latitude accorded to most student personnel workers, who, presumably, are in the best position to take efficient and effective action when student crises occur
5. Less mature and more economically dependent student bodies who are unable to demonstrate for any extended period of time because of pressures of jobs that await them
6. The absence of professional agitators who, instead of concentrating on junior colleges, are devoting their efforts and financial resources to the potentially more revolutionary campuses of four-year colleges and universities
7. Greater institutional restrictions regarding student discussion of controversial topics, invitations to off-campus speakers, campus demonstrations, and civil rights activities
8. The tendency of vocational students to accept institutional values
9. The decreased opportunity for junior college students, as campus commuters rather than as full-time residents of dormitories, to become activists
10. The relatively small enrollments at junior colleges which, in effect, decrease the size of demonstrations (18:5-7).

Lombardi, in noting the relative calm on junior college campuses, states "this can be of little comfort. . . to the presidents of colleges presently confronting activist students" (18:4). For those in need of written guidelines applicable to the junior college campus, there are few readily available sources. As pointed out in Lombardi's monograph, there is a scarcity of reports, studies, and descriptions of student activism in junior colleges–a statement that is corroborated by the following review of studies pertaining to student activism.

Studies of Student Activism

Initially, reports pertaining to college student activism were pedestrian in nature and tended to focus on events at a solitary campus. By 1966, however, formal research reports began to appear. Peterson's 1965 (26) and 1968 (27) studies assessed the issues of protest and the proportion of student bodies that participated at approximately one thousand accredited four-year degree-granting institutions in the United States. The following conclusions were stated in the 1968 report:

> (1) Campuses experiencing organized student protest of the Vietnam War almost doubled . . . between 1965 and 1968.
>
> (2) Activism toward a larger student role in campus governance (including curriculum development) . . . increased substantially.
>
> (3) Civil rights activism among college students (some 94 per cent of whom are white) . . . declined significantly. White student activists [were] . . . leaving prosecution of the on-going civil rights revolution to black activists.
>
> (4) From no such insistence in 1965, black college students . . . [began to] insist that their college provide educational experiences consistent with their new self-concept.
>
> (5) [The] proportion of activists within student bodies on campuses around the country did not increase (according to deans of students). (Substantially larger proportions of protesting students were reported only in

relation to the dress regulations issue.) This is not to say that the absolute number of activist students [did] not increase, for reasons outlined earlier.

(6) The number of colleges reporting student Left groups (. . . mainly . . . SDS chapters) almost doubled, from 26 per cent in 1965 to 46 per cent in 1968 (27).

A survey conducted by the United States National Student Association in 1968 revealed that 221 demonstrations (excluding Columbia University) occurred on 101 American campuses during the last half of the 1967-68 school year, involving 38,900 students, or 2.6 per cent of the student enrollment (22).

A study conducted by Bayer and Astin (3) was published in 1969. It assessed the incidence of campus protest, the mode of the protests, the issues, results, consequences, and changes that occurred during the 1968-69 academic year. The sample contained 427 colleges and universities. Of the 382 respondents, 79 were public or private two-year colleges. The authors wrote, with regard to junior colleges, that incidents of major protest are least likely to occur at that level of education. Bayer and Astin averred: "...virtually none of the private two-year colleges experienced either violent or disruptive protests. Among the public two-year colleges, only about one in 20 experienced an incident of violent protest; one in 10 experienced disruptive protests." [*Violent protest* was described as involving the damage or destruction of buildings, furnishings, records, files, or papers, or physical violence to one or more persons. *Disruptive protest* activities included any violent protests, as well as the occupation of buildings; the capture of college officials; the interruptions of classes, speeches, meetings, or other school functions; or general campus strikes or boycotts.]

According to an Urban Research Corporation report entitled *Student Protests 1969: Summary* (30), 292 major student protests occured on 232 college and university campuses in the first six months of 1969. "Protests were less common in technical schools, denominational schools, junior colleges, and very small schools in rural areas," stated the researchers. Other findings included:

1. Black students were involved in more than half of all protests.
2. Black recognition was the issue raised more than any other.
3. The Vietnam War was an issue in only 2 per cent of the protests.
4. Racially integrated protests were uncommon.
5. Violence of any kind occurred in less than one-fourth of the protests.
6. Twenty-two schools were closed temporarily as a result of protests.
7. The longer the protests, the more likely the protesters were to get their demands granted (30:12).

Twenty-eight junior colleges were among the 232 colleges cited in this report.

Social Issues and Protest Activity: Recent Student Trends (4) is a published report of Bayer, Astin, and Baruch's sampling of entering college freshmen at colleges that belong to the American Council on Education's Cooperative Institutional Research Program. The sample included 206,865 freshmen at 251 colleges in 1966; 185,848 freshmen at 252 colleges in 1967; 243,156 freshmen at 358 colleges in 1968; and 169,190 freshmen at 270 colleges in 1969. On the basis of their investigation, the researchers concluded: "...compared with their predecessors, the students now entering higher education are more concerned with effecting social change, more oriented toward activism, and more likely to exhibit characteristics which incline them to protest against the *status quo*" (4:31).

With the exception of the present report, the only empirical study focusing exclusively on *junior college* student protest was conducted by Milton Jones in 1968 (16). Jones surveyed deans of students at 94 junior colleges throughout the country and drew the following conclusions on the basis of 72 returns:

1. Student unrest activities in the junior colleges were primarily in the form of non-physical protest.
2. Situations involving food service, rules on dress and appearance, student publications, student representation in policy-making were most subject to protest activity.
3. Student representation in policy-making and student civil rights activities were the subjects of more defiant protest activities, especially in the Southwest.
4. Twenty per cent of the respondents indicated that some faculty members took active roles in protest situations.
5. Recommendations for appropriate actions for the college administration became more severe as protest activities became more defiant and disruptive.
6. Student personnel departments have made plans for possible protest situations. Only 10 per cent of the respondents indicated that no planning had been done.
7. Forty-five per cent of the responding institutions indicated that governing boards had taken no action on protest situations; seventeen per cent had adopted some policy.
8. Fifty-five per cent of the responding colleges indicated that no legal opinion had been sought concerning institutional response to protest activity.
9. Respondents rated the non-residential nature of the junior colleges as the most important reason for a lack of protest in these institutions. Counseling, faculty accessibility and concern, and student activities were rated important or very important.
10. Home and community influences and part- or full-time work were considered very important to the absence of protest activities at junior colleges.
11. Respondents agreed that attempting to meet student's needs and involving students in policy-making are very important factors in preventing student unrest from developing into protest activity (16:6).

Other notable research efforts or publications relating to student activism in general include Williamson and Cowan's survey of the regulations concerning speech and expression at 829 four-year institutions (36); Astin's report on personal and environmental factors relating to freshman protestors (2); Westby and Braungart's investigations of selected members of the Students for a Democratic Society (34); Haan, Smith, and Block's examination of the moral orientations of student activists (14); Sasajima, Davis, and Peterson's study relating incidents of student protest to scores on the College and University Environment Scales at 109 Colleges (28); the Cox Commission report on 1968 disturbances at Columbia University (8); Paulus's dissertation pertaining to Michigan State University activists (24); Gaddy's investigations of federal and state court decisions relating to student academic freedom (10;12); Altbach's bibliography on student activism (1); Momboisse's description of activist groups and tactics and suggested remedies for protestation (20); the report of the 1969 hearings conducted by the United States House of Representatives' Education Committee (6); and a review of research on junior college student activism, published in the *Junior College Research Review* (11:2-4).

CHAPTER II
The Survey Instrument

With permission from Peterson and the Educational Testing Service (which holds the copyright), the 1965 questionnaire used for surverying four-year colleges and universities (revised and administered again in 1968) was adapted for use in this study. Since different populations make comparisons between Peterson's study and the present one impossible, a detailed description of differences between the two instruments is considered unnecessary. Suffice it to note that the present form resembles Peterson's questionnaire primarily in format; the content was changed and supplemented significantly since (1) several of the protest issues listed in Peterson's study were considered irrelevant to junior colleges (e.g., classified defense and related research on campus) and (2) the demographic factors of significance to two-year colleges differ from those of Peterson's four-year college and universities.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire, a facsimile of which appears in Appendix A, consisted of 45 issues of protest, organized under five categories: Student-Administration, Off-Campus, Instruction, Faculty, and Freedom of Expression. A space was provided in each category for the listing of additional protest issues; these appear in Appendix C. For each issue, a respondent could indicate (1) whether no organized protest occurred at his campus during the preceding (1968-69) academic year, or--for those issues that were protested--(2) the number of different times each issue was protested, the largest percentage of full-time day students involved in a single incident, and the largest percentage of full-time faculty involved in a single incident. Regardless of the absence or presence of protest, all respondents were asked to complete the demographic section, which called for the following institutional data: type of institution, curriculum, total enrollment of full-time students, approximate percentage of the student body living on campus, approximate percentage of minority students enrolled, admissions policy, approximate percentage of student body belonging to radical student activists groups, classification of the college by geographic region, and classification of the college by community population. Two questions on existing campus riot plans also were included in the institutional data section. Space was provided for a respondent's name and address if he wished to receive a summary of the findings.

Cover Letters

Two cover letters were included with each questionnaire. The shorter one came from Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., executive director of the American Association of Junior Colleges, who encouraged the recipients to participate in the study. The longer letter explained the purpose of the survey and pledged anonymity to the respondent and his institution. Both letters are included in Appendix B.

The Population

Questionnaires were mailed in February 1970 to the dean of students at each of the 841 two-year, post-secondary institutions included in the American Association of Junior Colleges' institutional mailing list. As shown in Table I, these institutions represented forty-eight states, the District of Columbia, British Honduras, Canada, the Canal Zone, the Dominican Republic, France, Germany, Puerto Rico, Switzerland, and Turkey. By March 27--the prescribed cut-off date--613 usable returns (72.8 per cent) were received. Twenty-four additional questionnaires (2.9 per cent) were not included in the statistical analysis because (1) they were returned too late, (2) they were incorrectly filled out, or (3) they were returned from new institutions that were not in operation during the 1968-69 academic year. Combined with the 613 usable returns, a total of 637 (75.7 per cent of the population) responded.

Definition of Organized Protest Activities

Organized protest activities, as explained in the longer of the two cover letters, "connotes the existence of a group of reasonably like-minded students that sought in some collective manner to make its opposition to some existing situation known to the appropriate authorities." This definition was taken verbatim from Peterson's study.

Limitations

The most limiting factor of this study is that the responses, for the most part, represent only *perceptions* of protest. It is further limited by the fact that the perceptions come only from the deans of students. Undoubtedly, not all deans of students view protest issues in the same manner as students, faculty, members of the controlling board, or other administrators. Nevertheless, it is the dean of students who, perhaps more than any other individual on campus, has direct contact with the day-to-day activities of the student body.

Five other minor limitations are recognized in this survey.

1. Respondents were asked to base their answers on recollections of events that took place between September 1968 and June 1969; to induce a greater number of returns,

respondents were asked not to take time to search their files for documentary information. The accuracy of responses based on memories of student protest that occurred between nine and eighteen months earlier is, at best, subject to question. Nevertheless, it was believed that estimates for the most recent full academic year would be more meaningful than estimates based on only a portion of the 1969-70 academic year.

2. The sample itself could reflect a somewhat distorted view of junior college student activism. Only those institutions that were members of the American Association of Junior Colleges as of February 1970 were canvassed; 152 others existed at that time (according to the 1969 *AAJC Junior College Directory).* A substantial number of the 152 others, however, are believed to have been institutions either in their first months of operation or ones with small enrollments, neither of which would be likely to experience substantial student protest. Their having no or only small enrollments during the 1968-69 academic year provided little opportunity for students to organize protests.

3. Incomplete returns might have biased the results of this study. It does not account for experiences of student protest (if any) at more than 25 per cent of the junior colleges surveyed. (Nevertheless, a return of more than 70 per cent is considered by researchers to be a sound basis for extrapolation.)

4. The results of this survey reflect the scope of organized protest only for the academic year 1968-69. How closely the findings of this study resemble today's campus scene is not known.

5. For the purposes of estimating the extent of protest activities, the respondents were asked to include only full-time day students and full-time faculty members at their respective institutions. It was thought that greater distortion would occur if percentages represented students enrolled in evening programs (generally older students who take a reduced academic load) or part-time faculty members (who spend limited time on campus). To that extent, the scope of this survey fell short of the total student and faculty populations of the institutions.

Despite these limitations, the results of the survey need not be seriously questioned. The sample included almost all two-year institutions located in North America or sponsored by American interests abroad; responses came from nearly three out of four institutions surveyed.

CHAPTER III
Junior College Student Protest

The questionnaire used for this study was designed to elicit three measures of the degree of student protest: (1) the number of active incidents for forty-five issues; (2) the largest percentage of student involvement in any one protest; and (3) the largest percentage of faculty involvement in any one protest. The findings are presented in this chapter under the following headings:

Description of Respondent Institutions
Description of Colleges Reporting Protests
Issues of Protest
Protests by Region and Issue
Protests by Community Type
Percentage of Student Involvement in Protest Activism
Percentage of Faculty Involvement in Protest Activities

I. Description of Respondent Institutions

Of 841 questionnaries mailed to junior college deans of students, 613 (72.9 per cent) were returned by the March 27, 1970 deadline. The respondent institutions were characterized as follows: 467 public junior colleges, 96 independent junior colleges, and 44 parochial junior colleges. (Six respondents did not indicate the type of institution they represented.) For the most part, the responding colleges are comprehensive junior colleges (470). Ninety-one institutions are college-parallel only; 47 are vocational and technical colleges; and 5 did not indicate the type of curriculum being offered.

Most of the responding colleges (302) have a full-time student enrollment of under 1000. Medium-size enrollments (1000 to 3000 students) were indicated by 199 colleges; large enrollments (more than 3000 students), by 107 of the respondents.

Of the responding colleges, 389 reported no resident students, 74 reported resident students up to 25 per cent of their enrollments; 45 colleges reported 26 to 50 per cent; 39, from 51 to 75 per cent; and 61, from 76 to 100 per cent. Five respondents did not answer the question.

Few colleges reported that they had no minority students; 405 claimed a minority enrollment of 10 per cent or fewer. A substantial number (115) had minority student enrollments of 11 to 20 per cent; 31, from 21 to 30 per cent; 20, from 31 to 40 per cent; 5, from 41 to 50 per cent; and 14 claimed 50 per cent or more. Four deans did not respond to this item.

Over two-thirds of the responding colleges (471) have open-door admission policies, while 130 are selective. Twelve did not indicate their admission policies.

Many colleges (329) reported no students members of radical activist groups; 253 had 5 per cent or less. Twelve colleges indicated 6 to 10 per cent membership; 4, from 11 to 15 per cent; 2, from 16 to 20 per cent; and 1, more than 20 per cent. Twelve did not answer.

The 613 responding colleges were fairly well divided, geographically. There were 141 respondents from northern states, 126 from southern, 168 from midwestern, and 168 from western states. Six junior colleges did not indicate their regions and 10 omitted their geographic locations.

The classification of community populations revealed that 201 of the responding colleges are urban, 178 are suburban, and 221 are rural. Thirteen did not reply.

Although most colleges (347) claimed to have a "riot plan," only 208 indicated that non-campus law enforcement officers had been consulted in the development of those plans.

II. Description of Colleges Reporting Protests

Of the colleges reporting one or more organized protests, 77 per cent were under public control and 23 per cent under private or independent control. (Of the AAJC member colleges, 75 per cent are publicly controlled.) Table 1 shows the comparison of total population of colleges, respondent colleges, and protest colleges.

TABLE 1

	Control	
	Public	Independent
*Total College Population**	608	205
*Respondent Colleges***	467	140
*Colleges with Protests****	179	50

*Members of AAJC (1970 Directory). **Six schools did not indicate control. ***Two schools did not indicate control.

Of colleges reporting protests, 82 per cent offered comprehensive programs, 7 per cent offered only vocational-technical programs, and 11 per cent offered only college-parallel curriculums. These compare with 77 per cent of all the respondent colleges that were comprehensive, 8 per cent offering vocational-technical only, and 15 per cent with only college-parallel programs. Table 2 gives comparative numbers. (Equivalent statistics for the entire junior college population are not available.)

TABLE 2

Curriculum

	College-Parallel Only	Voc-Tech Only	Comprehensive
Respondent Colleges	91	47	470
Protest Colleges	25	15	186

Small enrollment--under 1000--was reported by 35 per cent of the protest colleges; another 35 per cent reported enrollments between 1000 and 3000. The remaining 30 per cent had enrollments over 3000. This is compared with proportions in the total population of *all* junior colleges in the U.S.: 52 per cent small colleges, 30 per cent medium, and 18 per cent large. Comparison figures for the total population of colleges, respondent colleges, and protest colleges are given in Table 3.

TABLE 3

Enrollment

	Under 1000	1000-3000	Over 3000
*Total College Population**	519	296	183
*Respondent Colleges***	302	199	107
*Colleges with Protests****	80	80	66

*All junior colleges in U.S. **Five schools did not indicate. ***Five schools did not indicate.

Protests were not confined to any one part of the country. Among colleges experiencing protests, 31 per cent were located in the North, 12 per cent in the South, 26 per cent in the Midwest, and 31 per cent in the West. This compares with the total member-colleges of AAJC proportions of 22 per cent northern colleges, 23 per cent southern, 28 per cent midwestern, and 27 per cent western. Comparison figures for AAJC member-colleges, respondent colleges, and protest colleges are given in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Region

	North	South	Midwest	West
*Total College Population**	180	186	225	230
*Respondent Colleges***	141	126	168	168
*Colleges with Protests****	70	26	59	70

*Institutional members of AAJC. **Ten schools did not indicate region. ***Six schools did not indicate region.

Of the protest colleges, 39 per cent served urban communities, 32 per cent served suburban communities, and 27 per cent served rural communities. Two per cent did not describe their community. Figures are not available for the total college population; however, of all the respondent colleges, 33 per cent were urbar , 29 per cent were suburban, and 36 per cent were rural. Two per cent did not reply. Figures comparing these two groups are given in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Community Type

	Urban	Suburban	Rural
*Respondent Colleges**	201	178	221
*Colleges with Protests***	90	73	63

*Thirteen colleges did not indicate type. **Five colleges did not indicate type.

Approximately 2 per cent of the protest colleges reported no minority student enrollment. About 59 per cent reported fewer than 10 per cent minority students, 23 per cent reported 11-20 per cent, 4 per cent reported 21-30 per cent, 3 per cent reported 31-40 per cent, 1 per cent reported 41-50 per cent, and 6 per cent reported over 50 per cent minority students. Although figures for the total AAJC membership are not available, among respondent colleges, 3 per cent indicated no minority student enrollment, 66 per cent reported fewer than 10 per cent, 19 per cent reported 11-20 per cent, 5 per cent indicated 21-30 per cent, 3 per cent reported 31-40 per cent, 1 per cent reported 41-50 per cent, and 2 per cent indicated a minority student enrollment over 50 per cent. Comparison figures for these groups are given in Table 6.

TABLE 6

Minority Enrollment

	None	1-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	50%
*Respondent Colleges**	19	405	115	31	20	5	14
*Colleges with Protest***	4	136	53	9	7	1	11

*Four colleges did not reply to this item. **Statistics taken from tabulations of protest colleges grouped by region and type of community. Of the 231 protest colleges, 10 could not be so classified. Discrepancies therefore include this overall discrepancy of 10.

Among the protest colleges, approximately 35 per cent claimed no students belonging to radical groups or, as one respondent put it, "None that we know of." Fifty-nine per cent estimated that 1-5 per cent of their enrollment belonged to radical groups, 4 per cent reported 6-10 per cent, 3 per cent

estimated 11-15 per cent, and 1 college estimated that over 20 per cent of its student body belonged to radical groups. This compares with the following estimates from respondent colleges: none, 54 per cent; 1-5 per cent, 41 per cent; 6-10 per cent, 2 per cent; 11-15 per cent, 1 per cent; 16-20 per cent, less than 1 per cent; and 20 per cent, one college. Comparison figures for these two groups are given in Table 7. Figures for the entire population of junior colleges are not available.

TABLE 7

Radical Students

	None	1-5%	6-10%	11-15%	16-20%	20%+
*Respondent Colleges**	329	253	12	4	2	1
*Colleges with Protests***	82	126	9	4	0	1

*Twelve did not specify. **See note on "Minority Enrollment."

In the protest college group, approximately 77 per cent had open-door admission policies, while 16 per cent were selective. The admission policy for the remaining 7 per cent is not known. In the respondent colleges, 77 per cent had open-door admissions, 21 per cent were selective, and 2 per cent were unknown. Figures for the entire population of junior colleges are not available. Comparison numbers are given in Table 8.

TABLE 8

Admissions

	Open-Door	Selective
*Respondent Colleges**	471	130
*Colleges with Protests***	178	36

*Twelve did not reply. **See note on "Minority Enrollment."

III. Issues of Protest

The total number of protests reported by the respondent colleges for all five categories (Student-Administration, Off-campus, Instruction, Faculty, and Freedom of Expression) was 1,586. A total of 382 colleges reported *no* protests; 231 (37.6 per cent) reported *some* protest. The greatest number of protests (46 per cent) was in the area of student administration (726). The second largest number of protests (20 per cent) concerned off-campus issues (316). Instructional issues accounted for 269 of the reported protests (17 per cent), faculty issues for 154 protests (9 per cent), and freedom of expression for 121 protests (8 per cent). The greatest number of schools reporting incidents on any one issue (77) gave a total of 140 protests on issues of opposition to military power; second in frequency of protest was the issue of institutional services (food and medical service, housing and recreational facilities) with 102 protests at 61 colleges.

Student-Administration Issues. The category accounting for the greatest number of protests was student-administration with 726 incidents at 156 colleges. As noted above, 61 schools reported 102 protests on the subject of institutional services. Other widely protested issues were dress regulations, 67 protests at 41 colleges; students unable to voice grievances, 67 protests at 35 colleges; dormitory and other living-group regulations, 55 protests at 32 colleges; disciplinary action against particular students, 46 protests at 36 colleges; lack of student participation in the establishment of campus policies, 44 protests at 23 colleges; and administration indifference or inaction concerning previous protest grievances, 40 protests at 21 colleges. The least frequently protested issues were policies and regulations on student sexual relations (2 protests at 2 colleges) and on-campus recruitment by a non-military firm or agency (2 protests at 2 colleges). Of the schools reporting protests, 68 per cent reported confrontations on one or more of these issues.

Off-Campus Issues. Protests relating to off-campus issues accounted for 316 incidents at 101 junior colleges. Seventy-seven colleges reported 140 protests over opposition to military power. The military draft was an issue 52 times at 28 campuses, while civil rights were at issue 52 times at 23 campuses. The issue least often protested was the mourning for student(s) killed or wounded in community protest (9 times at 4 campuses). Forty-five per cent of the protest colleges reported dealing with issues in this category.

Instruction. On 269 occasions, instructional issues were protested at 84 colleges, mostly about special educational programs for minority groups. Eighty-eight such protests were reported at 52 colleges. The combination or addition of certain courses to the curriculum was the second most frequently protested issue, with 60 incidents at 37 campuses. Only 19 protests at 14 campuses centered on the least protested issue: the prevailing system(s) of testing and/or grading. Thirty-six per cent of the protest colleges reported on one or more of these issues.

Faculty. Protest about junior college faculty focused primarily on a particular faculty member (48 campuses on 77 occasions). Fifty-four protests at 32 colleges dealt with faculty tenure policies. Fourteen schools reported 23 protests on the issue of faculty academic freedom. A total of 67 colleges (29 per cent of those reporting protests) had 154 protests on faculty issues.

Freedom of Expression. Censorship of certain publications was a protest issue on 61 occasions by 35 junior colleges. Rules regarding speeches or appearances by "controversial" persons were protested 34 times at 20 institutions. The most infrequent issue of protest in this category was the actual appearance by a particular person of rightist persuasion, 4 incidents at 3 schools. Twenty-four per cent (55 colleges) reported a total of 121 protests on issues related to freedom of expression.

IV. Protests by Region and Issue

In the number of schools reporting protests in each category of issue, there was little regional difference. All regions experienced the greatest number of protests in most schools on issues related to student-administration. Table 9 gives the number of schools reporting protests in each region by issue-category, as well as the number of protests.

TABLE 9

Protests by Region

Issue Category	North		South		Midwest		West	
	No. of Protests	No. of Colleges Reporting Protests*	No. of Protests	No. of Colleges Reporting Protests	No. of Protests	No. of Colleges Reporting Protests	No. of Protests	No. of Colleges Reporting Protests
Instruction	72	21	14	8	73	18	110	34
Faculty	54	20	6	4	34	17	60	22
Freedom of Expression	21	11	7	5	21	11	72	25
Student-Administration	229	51	100	15	149	36	248	48
Off-Campus	81	28	11	6	92	28	132	38
Total	457		138		369		622	

*Because some colleges did not indicate region, these totals do not exactly match those reported in the text above.

V. Protests by Community Type

As for the number of colleges reporting protests, the five issue-categories rank the same regardless of community type. Table 10 gives the number of protests and the number of schools experiencing protest by issue-category and type of community.

TABLE 10

Protests by Community Type

Issue Category	Urban		Suburban		Rural	
	No. of Protests	No. of Colleges Reporting Protests*	No. of Protests	No. of Colleges Reporting Protests	No. of Protests	No. of Colleges Reporting Protests
Instruction	142	37	93	28	34	16
Faculty	85	28	43	21	26	14
Freedom of Expression	52	20	49	20	20	12
Student-Administration	352	62	191	41	183	47
Off-Campus	171	43	89	32	56	25
Total	802		465		319	

*Discrepancies in totals with other figures given for each issue-category are due to inability in certain instances to classify by community type.

VI. Percentage of Student Involvement in Protest Activism

The greatest percentages of students participating in any one protest reported by each junior college, was in the category of student-administration. Eleven to 15 per cent of the student body at each of the schools participated in the largest of the protests on four issues: (1) policies and regulations regarding student drinking, (2) required attendance at school functions, (3) tuition charges and fees, and (4) dormitory and other living-group regulations (e.g., women's hours).

With respect to all five categories of protest, the largest percentage of students participating in any single issue ranged from 6 to 10 per cent. In the student-administration category, this was true for the following issues: (1) institutional services (e.g., food and medical service, housing and recreational facilities), (2) dress regulations, (3) disciplinary action against particular student(s), (4) alleged racial discrimination in admissions, (5) student-administration communication--students unable to voice grievances, (6) administrative indifference or inaction concerning previous protest grievances, (7) insufficient student participation in establishing campus policies (8) the appearance of non-campus police on campus, (9) requests or demands for amnesty (civil or academic), (10) administrative indifference or inaction concerning local community problems, and (11) allocation of funds. In issues relating to instruction, 6 to 10 per cent of the students

protested (1) class size, (2) the combinations or additions of certain courses, (3) the elimination of certain courses from curriculum, and (4) racism in class. Off-campus issues attracted 6 to 10 per cent of the student enrollment in protests relating to (1) military power, (2) mourning for student(s) killed or wounded in a community protest, and (3) sympathy with students at a four-year college or university. Under faculty issues, 6 to 10 per cent of the students protested (1) academic freedom, (2) faculty tenure policies, and (3) a controversy surrounding a particular faculty member.

The least amount of student involvement centered on the *student-administration issues* of (1) drugs, (2) sexual relations, (3) admissions policies for minority groups, (4) financial aid for minority students, (5) official recognition of student organizations on campus, (6) campus police, (7) administrative response to previous protest, (8) mourning for student(s) killed or wounded in campus protest, (9) on-campus recruitment by one or another of the armed services, and (10) on-campus recruitment by any other firm or agency; on the *freedom of expression issues* of (1) censorship, (2) rules on speeches and appearances by controversial persons, (3) the appearance of a leftist individual, and (4) the appearance of a rightist individual on *instructional* issues such as (1) poor instruction, (2) testing and grading systems, and (3) special educational programs for minority groups; and on the *off-campus issues* of (1) civil rights, (2) the draft, and (3) police brutality off campus.

It is noteworthy that no freedom of expression protest involved more than 5 per cent of the students, while each faculty issue involved between 6 and 10 per cent of them.

The greatest number of schools reported percentages of student involvement in the issue of military opposition (73), followed by institutional services (54), and special educational programs for minority students (52).

VII. Percentage of Faculty Involvement in Protest Activities

Faculty participation was highest in issues of academic freedom for faculty. Eleven to 15 per cent of the faculty at 16 colleges were involved in such protests. Other issues attracting an equal percentage of faculty involvement were the off-campus issues of police brutality and mourning for student(s) killed or wounded in community protest, and the instructional issue of large classes. In general, the schools reported protests involving less than 5 per cent of the faculty on most issues. Six to 10 per cent, however, did participate in the *student-administration issues* of (1) dress regulations, (2) student-administration communication–students unable to voice grievances, (3) the appearance of non-campus police on campus, and (4) opposition to administrative response concerning previous protest; in the *faculty issues* of (1) tenure policies and (2) controversy surrounding a particular faculty member; in the *off-campus issues* of (1) the draft and (2) sympathy with students at a four-year college or university; in the *instructional issue* of the elimination of certain courses from the curriculum; and in the *freedom of expression issue* of the appearance of a rightist person on campus.

However, more colleges reported faculty participation in the issues of (1) opposition to military power (at 58 colleges), (2) controversy surrounding a particular faculty member (at 36 colleges), and (3) special educational programs for minority groups (at 33 colleges).

CHAPTER IV
Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The recent upsurge of student activism and most of the known research pertaining to it was reviewed in Chapter I. It was noted that, while certain elements of this can be traced to earlier times, modern activism came to the forefront in the mid-1960's, first at the four-year colleges and universities, and later at lower levels of education. Most educational researchers have focused their attention on activism at levels other than the junior college. The present study was undertaken to determine the scope of the movement in two-year colleges and was based on returns to the questionnaire described in Chapter II; the findings were presented in Chapter III. A summary of the findings is presented below, as well as the offering of conclusions.

Summary of Findings

On the basis of a 72.9 per cent response of the junior college deans of students who were canvassed in this investigation, it was reported in the preceding chapter that 1,586 protests occurred at 231 junior colleges during the academic year 1968-1969. In other words, 37.7 per cent of the 613 responding colleges experienced organized protest.

Most of the 231 colleges reporting one or more protests are public, open-door junior colleges offering comprehensive curriculums. Most are commuter colleges and have a small percentage of minority students and students belonging to radical organizations. In proportion to the total population of community colleges, more large colleges (enrollments over 3000) experienced protests than did small and medium-sized colleges.

Protest colleges were located in all geographic regions, with the South containing the fewest. Relatively more colleges experiencing protests were located in urban communities than in suburban or rural communities.

Although most of the respondents report the existence of "riot plans" at their institutions, no more than a third involved non-campus law enforcement officers in their development.

The category of student-administration issues received the most protests, the leading issues being institutional services, dress regulations, grievance procedures, and dormitory and other living-group regulations.

The most frequently protested issue among the forty-five listed on the questionnaire was opposition to military power (e.g., Vietnam and ABM). The military draft and civil rights were other off-campus issues that received substantial protest.

Special educational programs for minority groups led the issues of protest in the area of instruction, while controversies surrounding particular faculty members and censorship of certain publications were the leading issues in the categories of faculty and freedom of expression, respectively.

In terms of the *number* of junior colleges experiencing protests, northern schools were proportionately higher; however, in terms of the *frequency of protests, western junior colleges were more active.*

Although the most frequently protested issues were military power and institutional services, the protests involving the greatest percentage of student enrollments related to student drinking, required attendance at school functions, tuition charges and fees, and dormitory and other living-group regulations. The latter issues involved up to 15 percent of the student enrollments. For the issues listed on the questionnaire as a whole, the average student body participation was 6 to 10 per cent. The average faculty involvement in protest activities was less than 5 per cent, although certain issues--notably academic freedom--provoked greater faculty participation. Faculty was most frequently involved in (1) opposition to military power, (2) controversies surrounding particular faculty members, and (3) special educational programs for minority groups.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This study provides no panacea for junior college officials. It does, however, provide norms with which officials (and others) may compare the situations at their own campuses and thereby more accurately understand their institution in relation to other two-year colleges.

Foremost among the conclusions of this study is that junior college officials have been underestimating the extent of protest activities at the junior college level. Board members, faculties, laymen, and especially administrators should be more sensitive to the restlessness that exists in the junior college today, for, while activism is not as rampant in two-year colleges as at four-year or secondary institutions, the time has ceased to be when junior colleges were cloaked with veils of tranquilty. Unless administrators, as change agents, take the initiative to become more aware of and responsive to current protests, junior colleges may soon find themselves in the same quagmire that engulfed the Berkeleys, Columbias, and Kent States of higher education.

The findings of this survey imply that, in many instances, effective communication has been lacking between junior college officials and dissidents. Responses to at least three issues listed in the questionnaire support this: 67 protests due to students being unable to voice grievances; 40 protests due to administrative indifference or inaction on previous

grievances; and 44 protests due to insufficient student participation in setting campus policies. Undoubtedly, some of these protests (and others indicated by the respondents) could have been prevented had administrators been more accessible to the students and (when accessible) more willing to participate in a "meaningful dialogue." This, of course, is more difficult, but not impossible, for the administrator in a large junior college. Even in institutions with large enrollments, administrators could have clear channels of communication via support personnel such as a campus ombudsman or the secretarial staff.

There is also a need for some of the junior colleges canvassed in this survey to examine their philosophies and goals in an effort to become more responsive to the needs of the community. For example, the mission of the institution, in some instances, should be geared more for minority groups. If junior colleges were truly meeting the needs of such students, there likely would not have been 88 protests on the issue of special educational programs for minority groups (e.g. black studies, compensatory programs) or 34 protests on financial aid for minority students.

Students (as well as faculty) should be given more active roles in the governance of their institutions---especially in formulating and reviewing rules and regulations. Administrators should establish procedures for such participation and should help create an atmosphere conducive to the discussion of these. Otherwise, such issues as dress and dormitory regulations will continue to face strong opposition by students. Disciplinary procedures should likewise be reviewed and formulated in conjunction with students. If given an opportunity to assist in the creation of their conduct standards and disciplinary actions for transgressors, students would not be as strongly motivated to protest such issues. (This is not to suggest that students should necessarily have the controlling hand in such endeavors--merely that their active participation should be invited.)

Certainly the institutional services of junior colleges should be examined carefully and improved where feasible. Good food and medical services, ample recreational facilities, and adequate housing (in residential colleges) could lessen the frequency of protest not only on these issues but on others as well.

Off-campus issues also play a major role in junior college protest, suggesting that they also need additional attention. What can college administrators do about military power, civil rights, the draft, and other matters beyond the realm of their authority? For one thing, greater sensitivity toward including current and meaningful topics and activities in classes and co-curricular functions could be encouraged. Also, information on draft deferments, voter registration, desegregation policies, and similar topics could be made available to students--without actual or implied enforcement of any one political philosophy. At times, administrators might even find it advantageous to take a public stand on certain domestic and foreign issues. Perhaps these steps, within themselves, would have little effect on affairs beyond the campus--but, *on campus*, the students would at least know that the school officials are aware of national and international problems.

Instructional reforms also seem to be needed. Students were particularly volatile in protesting the issue of special educational programs for minority groups and the combination or addition of certain courses to the curriculum. Could it be that junior college students, too, are beginning to demand a "relevant education?" Faculty policies--particularly tenure and academic freedom--also might be reviewed in an attempt to avoid conflicts leading to protest.

Censorship, the major cause of student protest in the freedom-of-expression category, should be avoided by administrative and faculty bodies. If necessary or desirable, officials could make the campus newspaper(s) legally independent of the college and thereby lessen their anxieties about "the school's image" since the writings would reflect student perceptions--not institutional policies. At any rate, students should be free to express themselves without fear of academic penalty and without prior publication approval from a non-student source.

Implicit in the data compiled in this study is that a spirit of humanism needs to be fostered. If faculties, administrators, board members, and laymen would regard students more as human beings (as reflected in the goals, policies, regulations, and programs of the college), less cause for protest would exist.

Junior colleges, compared with secondary schools and four-year colleges and universities, are relatively calm. With effective leadership from junior college officials, the threshold of the 1970's need not be the calm before the storm.

Bibliography

1. Altback, Philip. *Student Politics and Higher Education in the United States: A Select Bibliography.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: United Minorities in Higher Education and Center for International Affairs, 1968.

2. Astin, Alexander. "Personal and Environmental Determinants of Student Activism." Paper given at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, September 1968.

3. Bayer, Alan E. and Astin, Alexander W. *Campus Disruptions During 1968-1969.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

4. Bayer, Alan E., Astin, Alexander W., and Baruch, Robert F. *Social Issues and Protest Activity: Recent Student Trends.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970.

5. *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka.* 347 U.S. 483, 74 S. Ct. 686, 98 L. Ed. 873, Kansas, 1954.

6. Campus Unrest. Hearings Before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 91st Congress, 1st Session. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1969.

7. Cohen, Arthur M. *Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College.* Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1969.

8. *Crisis at Columbia.* New York: Random House, Inc., 1968.

9. *Dixon* v. *Alabama State Board of Education.* 294 F. (2d) 150 (5th Cir.); 368 U.S. 930, 82 S. Ct. 368, 7 L. Ed. (2d) 193, Alabama, 1961.

10. Gaddy, Dale. "Judicial Interpretations and Certain Other Aspects of Student Academic Freedom in American Higher Education." Doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1968.

11. ———. "Researchers Study Junior College Student Activism." *Junior College Research Review.* 4:2-4, May 1970.

12. ———. *Student Activism and the Junior College Administrator: Judicial Guidelines.* Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1968.

13. Gallagher, Buell G. "Pressures, Priorities, and Process." *Current Issues in Higher Education,* 20:55-62, March 7, 1965.

14. Haan, Norma, Smith, M. Brewster, and Block, Jeanne H. "Moral Reasoning of Young Adults: Political-Social Behavior, Family Background, and Personality Correlates." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 10:183-201, November 1968.

15. Irwin, Don. "Deaths Argue Against Violence, Nixon Says." *Los Angeles Times,* May 5, 1970. p. 6.

16. Jones, Milton O. *Student Protest in the Junior College: A National Survey of Student Unrest and Protest Activities in the Junior College.* (Mimeo) 1968. ED 028 780.

17. Lanier, Luther N. "The Role of the Police in Campus Disorders: A Policeman's View." *Junior College Research Review.* 4:9-10, May 1970.

18. Lombardi, John. *Activism in Junior Colleges: An Administrator's Views.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969. ED 028 767.

19. Metzner, Seymour. "School Violence in Historical Perspective." Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Convention, Los Angeles, February 1969.

20. Momboisse, Raymond M. *Control of Student Disorders.* Sacramento, California: MSM Enterprises, 1968.

21. Najam, Edward W., Jr. "The Student Voice: A New Force." *Educational Leadership,* May 1969. pp. 749-753.

22. "101 Campuses Identified as Demonstration Scenes." *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* September 2, 1968.p.5

23. "One Student Killed as Violent Protests Hit 8 Campuses. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* April 27, 1970, p. 1.

24. Paulus, George. "A Multivariate Analyses Study of Student Activist Leaders, Student Government Leaders, and Nonactivists." Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968.

25. *People ex rel. Goldenkoff* v. *Albany Law School,* 198 App. Div. 460, 191 N.Y.S. 349 (1921)

26. Peterson, Richard E. *The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1964-1965.* Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1966.

27. ———. *The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1967-1968.* Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1968.

28. Sasajima, Jasu, Davis, T. A., and Peterson, R. E. "Organized Student Protest and Institutional Climate." *American Educational Research Journal,* 5:291-304, April 1968.

29. Shaffer, Helen B. "Discipline in Public Schools." *Editorial Research Reports,* August 27, 1969, pp. 635-652.

30. *Student Protests 1969: Summary.* Chicago: Urban Research Corporation, 1970.

31. Trombley, William. "Kerr Sees End of Rebellion on Campus." *Los Angeles Times,* February 8, 1970. p.1.

32. "Troops Kill Four Students in Antiwar Riot at Ohio College." *Los Angeles Times,* May 5, 1970, p.1.

33. Trump, T. Lloyd and Hunt, Jane. "The Nature and Extent of Student Activism." *NASSP Bulletin,* May 1969, pp. 150-158.

34. Westby, D.L. and Braungart, R.G. "The Alienation of Generations and Status Politics: Alternate Explanation of Student Political Activism." In Segal, Roberta (Ed.) *Political Socialization.* New York: Random House, 1968.

35. "What's Wrong with the High Schools." *Newsweek,* February 16, 1970, pp. 65-69.

36. Williams, E.G. and Cowan, John L. *The American Student's Freedom of Expression: A Research Appraisal.* Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1966.

37. Younger, E.J. "Violence and Education." *Los Angeles Bar Bulletin,* 44:513, September 1969.

APPENDIX A Questionnaire

SURVEY OF ORGANIZED STUDENT PROTEST IN AMERICAN JUNIOR COLLEGES, 1968-69

DIRECTIONS: Please read cover letter first. Then, using a soft lead pencil, place an "X" inside each appropriate box. Base judgments on protest activities during the period September 1968 to June 1969.

Additional comments on the reverse side of the questionnaire are welcomed. Your name and address on the reverse side will facilitate sending you a report of the results.

Persons completing and returning this questionnaire will not be identified in any subsequent report, nor will the colleges represented by them.

Complete as much of the questionnaire as you can; however, do not feel compelled to answer all questions asked. You are not expected to research your answers; instead, base your answers on your recollection of past incidents.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

1. Place an "X" in the box under A. No organized protest

OR

2. Place an "X" in one box under EACH of

   B. Number of different times each issue was protested

   C. Largest percentage of full-time day students involved in a single incident

   D. Largest percentage of full-time faculty involved in a single incident

3. All respondents are requested to complete the portion of the questionnaire entitled "Institutional Data" even if no protest was experienced.

4. Please fold and return this questionnaire in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope by or before March 27.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

(Portions of this questionnaire were adapted from Survey of Organized Student Protest. Copyright © 1965 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. Adapted by permission.)

SURVEY OF ORGANIZED STUDENT PROTEST IN AMERICAN JUNIOR COLLEGES, 1968-69

ISSUES OF PROTEST

	Instruction
1.	Classes typically too large, instruction too impersonal
2.	Poor quality of instruction--in general or specific instances
3.	Generally prevailing system(s) of testing and/or grading
4.	Combination or addition of certain courses to curriculum
5.	Elimination of certain courses for curriculum
6.	Racism in class
7.	Special educational programs for minority groups (e.g., black studies, compensatory programs)
8.	Other (please specify): _____
	Faculty
9.	Academic freedom for faculty--in principle
10.	Faculty tenure policies (including hiring, promotion, and dismissal)
11.	Controversy surrounding a particular faculty member
12.	Other (please specify): _____
	Freedom of Expression
13.	Censorship of certain publications (e.g., student newspaper)
14.	Campus rules regarding speeches, appearances by "controversial" persons
15.	Actual appearance by a particular person of leftist persuasion
16.	Actual appearance by a particular person of rightist persuasion
17.	Other (please specify): _____
	Student Administration
18.	Institutional services (e.g., food and medical service, housing and recreational facilities)
19.	Dress regulations
20.	Policies, regulations regarding student drinking
21.	Policies, regulations regarding student use of drugs
22.	Policies, regulations regarding student sexual relations
23.	Required attendance at school functions
24.	Disciplinary action against particular student(s)
25.	Tuition charges and fees
26.	Alleged racial discrimination in admissions
27.	Special admissions policies for minority groups
28.	Student-administration communication, students unable to voice grievances
29.	Financial aid for minority students
30.	Official recognition of student organizations on campus
31.	Administrative indifference or inaction concerning previous protest grievances
32.	Insufficient student participation in establishing campus policies
33.	The appearance of non-campus police on campus
34.	The policies and practices of campus police
35.	Requests or demands for amnesty (civil or academic)
36.	Opposition to administrative response concerning previous protest
37.	Mourning for student(s) killed or wounded in campus protest
38.	On-campus recruitment by one or another of the armed services
39.	On-campus recruitment by any other firm or agency (e.g., DOW, CIA)
40.	Administrative indifference or inaction concerning local community problems
41.	Dormitory and other living group regulations (e.g., women's hours)
42.	Allocation of funds
43.	Other (please specify): _____
	Off Campus
44.	Civil rights: local area (off-campus)--protest and/or work (e.g., voter registration, desegregation)
45.	The draft
46.	Opposition to military power (e.g., Vietnam, ABM)
47.	Police brutality off campus
48.	Mourning for student(s) killed or wounded in community protest
49.	Protest in sympathy with students at four-year college or university
50.	Other (please specify): _____

A.	B. Number of different times each issue was protested						C. Largest percentage of full-time day students involved in a single incident							D. Largest percentage of full-time faculty involved in a single incident						
No organized protest	1	2	3	4	5+		None	5% or fewer	6% to 10%	11% to 15%	16% to 20%	21% to 25%	More than 25%		None	5% or fewer	6% to 10%	11% to 15%	16% to 20%	21% to 25%	More than 25%

Institutional Data

A. Type of institution
- Public junior college . . . . . ☐
- Independent junior college . . . . . ☐
- Parochial junior college. . . . . ☐

B. Curriculum
- College parallel only . . . . . ☐
- Vocational or technical only. . . . . ☐
- Comprehensive junior college. . . . . ☐

C. Total enrollment (full time students)
- Small (less than 1000). . . . . ☐
- Medium (1000 to 3000) . . . . . ☐
- Large (more than 3000). . . . . ☐

D. Approximate percent of student body living <u>on</u> campus

None ☐ 25% or fewer ☐

26% to 50% ☐ 51% to 75% ☐

76% to 100% ☐

E. Approximate percent of minority students enrolled (Black, Chicano, Oriental, Puerto Rican, etc.)

None ☐ 10% or fewer ☐

11% to 20% ☐ 21% to 30% ☐

31% to 40% ☐ 41% to 50% ☐

More than 50% ☐

F. Admissions

Selective ☐ Open-Door ☐

G. Approximate percent of student body belonging to radical student activist group (e.g., Students for a Democratic Society, Black Students Union, etc.)

None ☐ 5% or fewer ☐ 6% to 10% ☐

11% to 15% ☐ 16% to 20% ☐

More than 20% ☐

H. Classification of college by region

North (Conn., Del., D.C., Maine, Mass., Md., N.H., N.J., Pa., R.I., Vt.) ☐

South (Ala., Ark., Fla., Ga., La., Miss., N.C., S.C., Tenn., Va.) ☐

Midwest (Ill., Ind., Iowa, Kan., Ky., Mich., Minn., Mo., Neb., N.D., Ohio, S.D., W.Va., Wisc.) ☐

West (Alas., Ariz., Calif., Colo., Ha., Idaho, Mont., Nev., N.M., Okla., Oreg., Texas, Utah, Wash., Wyo.) ☐

I. Classification of college by community population

Urban ☐ Suburban ☐ Rural ☐

J. Does your college have a "riot plan" for the restoration of order to the campus should violence erupt?

yes ☐ no ☐

K. If a riot plan exists at your college, were non-campus law enforcement officers involved in its development?

yes ☐ no ☐

--OPTIONAL--

If you wish to receive a summary of the findings, please print your name and address below.

Name _____

Address _____

_____

_____

ZIP

APPENDIX B
Cover Letters

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES / **50th YEAR**

ONE DUPONT CIRCLE, N.W., WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036 / (202) 293-7050

EDMUND J. GLEAZER, JR.
Executive Director

WILLIAM G. SHANNON
Associate Executive Director

February 1970

Dear Colleague:

The number of questionnaires distributed to educational administrators is unquestionably alarming. The American Association of Junior Colleges considers the enclosed questionnaire, however, to be one of great significance and urges you to complete and return it as directed -- at the earliest time possible.

Although several studies of student activism in four-year colleges and universities have been conducted, this is the first nationwide attempt to assess the phenomenon of student activism in two-year colleges. The results of this study not only could show the situation for the most recent academic year, but possibly could provide direction for future action.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.
Executive Director

EJG/el

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

February 1970

Dear Dean of Students:

Student unrest has become one of the most controversial, perplexing problems in American higher education today. Although most of the recorded incidents of student protest have occurred at four-year and graduate-level institutions of higher learning, junior/community colleges have not escaped this phenomenon.

In an attempt to determine the scope of organized student protest in America's 1000 two-year colleges and the response of administrators to the resulting problems, I have prepared the enclosed questionnaire (adapted, in part, from a study by Educational Testing Service). By completing this questionnaire as promptly and accurately as you can and returning it for analysis, you can help establish a picture of student protest in the two-year college--a picture that could help Deans of Students (and other administrators) to deal more effectively with student protest.

This survey is limited to organized protest activities during the period September 1968 to June 1969. As used in this survey, "organized protest activities" connotes the existence of a group of reasonably like-minded students that sought in some collective manner to make its opposition to some existing situation known to the appropriate authorities.

In filling out this questionnaire, you are not expected to take time to search your files for documentary information. Rather, you should base your answers on recollections of incidents from last year. The purpose of this survey is to draw a broad picture of the national situation; therefore, estimates rather than precise data will suffice.

Total anonymity is pledged to all participants. No institution or individual will be identified in subsequent reports; data will be presented in percentages and correlation coefficients. Thus, you are urged to be completely candid in your responses.

This survey is being done as part of my work on a Kellogg postdoctoral fellowship at the University of California at Los Angeles, under the direction of Professor B. Lamar Johnson. The results will be published in the American Association of Junior Colleges/ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges monograph series.

While you have this material before you, won't you please complete it and return it as soon as possible? Tabulations and analyses will be based on all returns received by March 27. Your cooperation will be appreciated!

Thank you for any consideration given to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Dale Gaddy

Dale Gaddy

P.S. If you would like to receive a summary of the findings of this survey prior to the publication of the final report, please print your name and address on the fourth page of the questionnaire.

APPENDIX C
Additional Issues of Organized Student Protests

Instruction

1. Lack of freedom of discussion
2. Mexican versus student government
3. Prep math, study skills
4. Protest was in support of teachers' strike
5. Organize Polish studies
6. Students met with administration for discussion
7. Extension of Christmas recess
8. Dancing and women's smoking
9. Student evaluation of faculty
10. Wanted library open longer hours
11. More library material pertinent to Blacks
12. Had a concerned group working with administration
13. Cut policy
14. Teacher evaluation
15. Evaluation of faculty as hard-to-read teachers
16. Campus dress codes in classroom
17. Police science and veterans' desire modification in P.E. requirements (discussed, not protested)
18. Library not adequate (sit in)
19. Needy students - meals and book program .

Faculty

1. Need for more Black faculty
2. Pay raise
3. Salary impasse
4. Salary - contractual services
5. Hire a Black counselor.

Freedom of Expression

1. Poor quality of student newspaper (scandalous and obscene articles)
2. Protest against article in newspaper
3. Minority group column in student paper
4. Regulations on distribution of off-campus publications
5. Letters to the editor
6. Actual appearance of person reading "obscene" poetry in cafeteria
7. Greater student involvement in a program or higher education
8. Freedom of expression in principle
9. Lowering flag for Malcolm X day.

Student Administration

1. Bookstore prices
2. Lack of communications in advising Blacks
3. Organization that they were getting funds
4. Brother arrested in community for criminal act
5. Basketball award
6. Registration procedures
7. Change of student election system
8. Request for cigarette machine on campus
9. Library hours

10. Parking facilities

11. Special facilities for specific groups

12. Question of search and seizure of stolen goods from a dormitory room without a search warrant (even though permission to search is written out in college regulations as stated in the student handbook)

13. Recognition of student government organization of SDS

14. Sit-in (sympathy with Berkeley Peoples Park)

15. Attendance regulations

16. Regulation in intramural athletics

17. Height of traffic speed bumps

18. Parietals

19. Parking lot conditions (potholes, inadequate space)

20. Review of cut policy

21. The cut system - attendance regulations

22. Permit religious services on campus

23. Tutoring.

Off-Campus

1. March on draft board on moratorium days

2. Drinking age

3. City ordinance banning "inflamatory" literature

4. Labor Relations (Standard Oil strike)

5. Participation of several faculty members in the grape boycott

6. Demonstration to lower voting age to 18 years

7. Holding of prisoners in Vietnam

8. Fleming Bill, Pennsylvania State Legislature (proposes withdrawing aid from students involved in on- or off-campus protests)

9. Firing of Black employee.